

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113 US
Office Action Date: January 8, 2008

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed January 8, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 14, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendments and no new issues have been raised by the amendments.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 15 and 16 were objected to due to the recitation "adapted to" being interpreted as not constituting a limitation in any patentable sense. Applicant has amended claims 15 and 14 to delete the term "adapted to" and replace same with "comprising means for." Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/18066 to Bender et al. (hereinafter Bender) in view of the admitted prior art ("APA") as disclosed by the Applicant in the specification FIG. 1, page 1, lines 12-22. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 14 and 16 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, two separate device registrations for registering the first device and the bridge device as

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113 US
Office Action Date: January 8, 2008

wireless devices on the wireless network, to be consistent with independent claims 1 and 15.

Bender discusses techniques of interfacing data terminal equipment units to wireless data networks. More particularly, it discloses a wireless modem for connecting a terminal equipment unit located on a wireline to a network unit over a wireless link. The wireless modem comprises a local server for assigning an IP address to the terminal equipment unit.

The problem solved by Bender is to provide means for negotiating IP addresses and to avoid the transmission of broadcast messages from the network link over a wireless link in order to conserve the bandwidth and capacity of the wireless link. See page 5, lines 6-14.

In a first embodiment of Bender, described on page 11, lines 3-7, the wireless modem is pre-assigned an IP address for its own use, and another IP address is stored in a local server for assignment to the terminal equipment unit.

In a second embodiment, indicated on page 12, lines 15-22, the local server may store more than one permanent IP address. In addition, Bender states that its invention is also applicable to multiple terminal equipment units.

While Bender discloses a wireless link between the wireless modem 42 and the network unit 58, please note that, as illustrated in FIGS. 3A and 3B, the wireless link is a point to point link between **only two devices**.

In Bender, when the terminal equipment unit 40 is assigned an IP address, it can communicate to the network unit 58 over the wireless link, through the wireless modem. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Bender could be read as disclosing a method for

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113 US
Office Action Date: January 8, 2008

connecting a device to a wireless network, note that in Bender the terminal equipment unit 40 is NOT considered a wireless device, and it is certainly not registered to the network unit as a wireless device.

In stark contrast, the present invention involves a bridge device separately registered to an access point, a device and the bridge device (with their respective addresses) as wireless devices on a wireless network. Bender does not disclose or suggest at least a bridge device for separately registering to the access point with the respective addresses of a device and a bridge device, the device and itself as wireless devices on a wireless network, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16.

Furthermore, Bender does not disclose registering to an access point with the respective addresses, the device and itself as wireless devices on the wireless network, wherein the registration is performed through an authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16. Instead, Bender discloses a wireless modem that connects terminal equipment units 40 to the network unit 58. As indicated in Bender, on page 11 lines 3-6, the wireless modem receives a set of IP addresses from the remote server 60. It stores the addresses in a local server 52. Then it determines an IP address for its own use and for the terminal equipment unit. It and the terminal equipment unit can then communicate to the network unit 58 through the wireless link. Bender does NOT disclose that the wireless modem connects terminal equipments to the wireless network.

The admitted prior art "APA" as indicated in page 1 line 12-22 of the application fails to cure the deficiencies of Bender. Namely, the APA fails to disclose or suggest separately registering to the access point with the respective addresses, the device and

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113 US
Office Action Date: January 8, 2008

itself as wireless devices on the wireless network, wherein the registration is performed through an authentication and an association process of the type as defined by the IEEE 802.11 standard, essentially as claimed in claims 1, 14, 15 and 16.

The Applicant further notes that with regards to claim 2, the examiner points to the MAC address indicated in page 9, line 31, and on page 10, lines 13-20 of Bender, as allegedly showing that Bender discloses using the MAC address to perform the method of claim 1. However, page 9, line 31 and page 10, lines 13-20, actually introduce the BootP and DHCP. They point to the common hardware address that is attached to each device on an Ethernet system. There is no relationship between that hardware address and the present invention's method which uses a MAC address to register the device as a wireless device. One skilled in the art would not use the MAC address as indicated in the present application with the knowledge of Bender.

Therefore, claims 1, 14, 15 and 16 are patentable in view of Bender. Claims 2-13 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1 and are thus believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as those discussed above. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection in view of Bender and the APA is respectfully requested.

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. PF020113 US
Office Action Date: January 8, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 04 2008


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of the claims set forth in the Final Office Action of January 8, 2008 be withdrawn, that pending Claims 1-16 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

In the event that any additional fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the application, they may be charged to applicant's representatives Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Paul Kiel
Registration No. 40,677

m

Mailing Address:

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
PATENT OPERATIONS
P.O. BOX 5312
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 4-4-08